



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/776,479	02/02/2001	Robert L. Bratzler	C1037/7013 (HCL/MAT)	7139

7590 10/19/2007
Helen C. Lockhart
c/o Wolf Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210

EXAMINER

MINNIFIELD, NITA M⁴

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1645

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/19/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/776,479	Applicant(s) BRATZLER ET AL.	
	Examiner N. M. Minnifield	Art Unit 1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 15-17 and 38-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 41, 43, 46 and 49-51 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12 15-17 38-40 42 44 45 47 48 52-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' amendment filed July 23, 2007 is acknowledged and has been entered. Claims 1-11, 13, 14 and 18-37 have been canceled. Claim 12 has been amended. Claims 12, 15-17, 38-40, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48 and 52 are now pending in the present application. All rejections have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment to the claims and/or comments, with the exception of those discussed below.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. This application contains claims 41, 43, 46 and 49-51 are drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the paper filed August 18, 2004. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 12, 15-17, 38-40, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48 and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant

art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is written description rejection.

The pending claims are directed to a method for treating or preventing an asthmatic event in a hypo-responsive subject having allergic asthma, comprising: administering to a hypo-responsive subject having allergic asthma a CpG immunostimulatory nucleic acid (8-100 nucleotides) in an effective amount for treating or preventing an asthmatic event, wherein the hypo-responsive subject is not a neonate. The claims also recite that sub-therapeutic amounts of an asthma/allergy medicament would be administered to the subject.

A review of the specification discloses a list of immunostimulatory nucleic acids that could be used in the claimed method (see Table 1). The claims only provide that the immunostimulatory nucleic acid has 2 nucleotides (C and G). However, the specification does not indicate which one of the 1093 nucleotide sequences found on Table 1 (pp. 12-33) functions in a method for treating or preventing an asthmatic event in a hypo-responsive subject having allergic asthma, comprising: administering to a hypo-responsive subject having allergic asthma a CpG immunostimulatory nucleic acid (8-100 nucleotides) in an effective amount for treating or preventing an asthmatic event, wherein the hypo-responsive subject is not a neonate. The specification teaches that allergic asthma is an allergic condition. The specification discloses a list of commonly used treatment/medicaments for treating asthma/allergy/allergic asthma (see pp. 48-53; Tables 2 and 3). Dependent claims recite that asthma/allergy medicaments will be administered to the hypo-responsive subject in addition to the CpG immunostimulatory nucleic acids. However, evidence of which asthma/allergy medicaments are to be used with the vast genus of CpG immunostimulatory

nucleic acids has not been disclosed. The specification teaches that preventing refers to a prophylactic treatment, which increases the resistance of a subject to an allergen or initiator (p. 58). A sub-therapeutic dosage is a dosage, which is less than that dosage which would produce a therapeutic result in the subject if administered alone; it would not produce the desired therapeutic result in a subject (p. 71). An effective amount of an immunostimulatory nucleic acid and an asthma /allergy medicament refers to the amount necessary or sufficient to realize a desired biologic effect (see pp. 68-69). The specification discloses method steps/procedures, possible dosages and composition components. However, all of these are described in prophetic terms; there is no enablement/examples set forth in the specification of *in vitro* assays, *in vivo* animal models or *in vivo* human examples that would indicate enablement of the claimed invention.

MPEP § 2163.02 states, "[a]n objective standard for determining compliance with the written description requirement is, 'does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invented what is claimed' ". The courts have decided: The purpose of the "written description" requirement is broader than to merely explain how to "make and use"; the applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the "written description" inquiry,, whatever is now claimed. See *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Federal Circuit, 1991). Furthermore, the written description provision of 35 USC § 112 is severable from its enablement provision; and adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606

(CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. The Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1, "Written Description" Requirement (66 FR 1099-1111, January 5, 2001) state, "[p]ossession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing the invention was 'ready for patenting' such as by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention" (Id. at 1104). Moreover, because the claims encompass a genus of compositions, an adequate written description of the claimed invention must include sufficient description of at least a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. However, factual evidence of an actual reduction to practice has not been disclosed by Applicant in the specification; nor has Applicant shown the invention was "ready for patenting" by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete; nor has Applicant described distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant were in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

The Guidelines further state, "[f]or inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus" (Id. at 1106); accordingly, it follows that an adequate written description of a genus cannot be achieved in the absence of a disclosure of at least one species within the genus.

Therefore, absent a detailed and particular description of a representative number, or at least a substantial number of the members of the genus of compositions, the skilled artisan could not immediately recognize or distinguish members of the claimed antigenic compositions. In view of the above, the instant specification fails to meet the written description requirement as set forth under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

A lack of adequate written description issue also arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (a “laundry list” disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not “reasonably lead” those skilled in the art to any particular species); *In re Ruschig*, 379 F.2d 990, 995, 154 USPQ 118, 123 (CCPA 1967) (“If n-propylamine had been used in making the compound instead of n-butylamine, the compound of claim 13 would have resulted. Appellants submit to us, as they did to the board, an imaginary specific example patterned on specific example 6 by which the above butyl compound is made so that we can see what a simple change would have resulted in a specific supporting disclosure being present in the present specification. The trouble is that there is no such disclosure, easy though it is to imagine it.”) (emphasis in original); *Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Faulding Inc.*, 230 F.3d 1320, 1328, 56 USPQ2d 1481, 1487 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (“the specification does not clearly disclose to the skilled artisan that the inventors ... considered the ratio... to be part of their invention There is therefore no force to Purdue’s argument that the written description

requirement was satisfied because the disclosure revealed a broad invention from which the [later-filed] claims carved out a patentable portion”).

A specification may describe an actual reduction to practice by showing that the inventor constructed an embodiment or performed a process that met all the limitations of the claim and determined that the invention would work for its intended purpose. *Cooper v. Goldfarb*, 154 F.3d 1321, 1327, 47 USPQ2d 1896, 1901 (Fed. Cir. 1998). See also *UMC Elecs. Co. v. United States*, 816 F.2d 647, 652, 2 USPQ2d 1465, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (“[T]here cannot be a reduction to practice of the invention without a physical embodiment which includes all limitations of the claim.”); *Estee Lauder Inc. v. L’Oreal, S.A.*, 129 F.3d 588, 593, 44 USPQ2d 1610, 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (“[A] reduction to practice does not occur until the inventor has determined that the invention will work for its intended purpose.”); *Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 79 F.3d 1572, 1578, 38 USPQ2d 1288, 1291 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (determining that the invention will work for its intended purpose may require testing depending on the character of the invention and the problem it solves). Description of an actual reduction to practice of a biological material may be shown by specifically describing a deposit made in accordance with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.801 et seq. See especially 37 CFR 1.804 and 1.809. See also paragraph I., supra. MPEP 2163 This actual reduction to practice of the claimed invention is not set forth in the instant specification.

For some biomolecules, examples of identifying characteristics include a sequence, structure, binding affinity, binding specificity, molecular weight, and length. Although structural formulas provide a convenient method of demonstrating possession of specific molecules, other identifying characteristics or combinations of characteristics may demonstrate the requisite possession. >As

explained by the Federal Circuit, “(1) examples are not necessary to support the adequacy of a written description; (2) the written description standard may be met ... even where actual reduction to practice of an invention is absent; and (3) there is no per se rule that an adequate written description of an invention that involves a biological macromolecule must contain a recitation of known structure.” *Falkner v. Inglis*, 448 F.3d 1357, 1366, 79 USPQ2d 1001, 1007 (Fed. Cir. 2006). See also *Capon v. Eshhar*, 418 F.3d at 1358, 76 USPQ2d at 1084 (“The Board erred in holding that the specifications do not meet the written description requirement because they do not reiterate the structure or formula or chemical name for the nucleotide sequences of the claimed chimeric genes” where the genes were novel combinations of known DNA segments.).< For example, disclosure of an antigen fully characterized by its structure, formula, chemical name, physical properties, or deposit in a public depository provides an adequate written description of an antibody claimed by its binding affinity to that antigen. *Noelle v. Lederman*, 355 F.3d 1343, 1349, 69 USPQ2d 1508, 1514 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (holding there is a lack of written descriptive support for an antibody defined by its binding affinity to an antigen that itself was not adequately described). Additionally, unique cleavage by particular enzymes, isoelectric points of fragments, detailed restriction enzyme maps, a comparison of enzymatic activities, or antibody cross-reactivity may be sufficient to show possession of the claimed invention to one of skill in the art. See *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966 (“written description” requirement may be satisfied by using “such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that fully set forth the claimed invention”). A definition by function alone “does not suffice” to sufficiently describe a coding sequence “because it is only an indication of what the gene

does, rather than what it is.” *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406. See also *Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1169-71, 25 USPQ2d at 1605-06 (discussing *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 18 USPQ2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). An adequate written description of a chemical invention also requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, and not merely a wish or plan for obtaining the chemical invention claimed. See, e.g., *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 358 F.3d 916, 927, 69 USPQ2d 1886, 1894-95 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (The patent at issue claimed a method of selectively inhibiting PGHS-2 activity by administering a non-steroidal compound that selectively inhibits activity of the PGHS-2 gene product, however the patent did not disclose any compounds that can be used in the claimed methods. While there was a description of assays for screening compounds to identify those that inhibit the expression or activity of the PGHS-2 gene product, there was no disclosure of which peptides, polynucleotides, and small organic molecules selectively inhibit PGHS-2. The court held that “[w]ithout such disclosure, the claimed methods cannot be said to have been described.”).

It is noted that Applicants have claimed a large genus of CpG immunostimulatory nucleic acids with only the C and G being defined in the CpG immunostimulatory nucleic acid. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice (see i)(A), above), reduction to drawings (see i)(B), above), or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics,

sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus (see i)(C), above). See *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

A “representative number of species” means that the species, which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus. The disclosure of only one species encompassed within a genus adequately describes a claim directed to that genus only if the disclosure “indicates that the patentee has invented species sufficient to constitute the gen[us].” See *Enzo Biochem*, 323 F.3d at 966, 63 USPQ2d at 1615; *Noelle v. Lederman*, 355 F.3d 1343, 1350, 69 USPQ2d 1508, 1514 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (Fed. Cir. 2004)(“[A] patentee of a biotechnological invention cannot necessarily claim a genus after only describing a limited number of species because there may be unpredictability in the results obtained from species other than those specifically enumerated.”). “A patentee will not be deemed to have invented species sufficient to constitute the genus by virtue of having disclosed a single species when ... the evidence indicates ordinary artisans could not predict the operability in the invention of any species other than the one disclosed.” In re *Curtis*, 354 F.3d 1347, 1358, 69 USPQ2d 1274, 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2004)(Claims directed to PTFE dental floss with a friction-enhancing coating were not supported by a disclosure of a microcrystalline wax coating where there was no evidence in the disclosure or anywhere else in the record showing applicant conveyed that any other coating was suitable for a PTFE dental floss.) On the other hand, there may be situations where one species adequately supports a genus. See, e.g., *Rasmussen*, 650 F.2d at 1214, 211 USPQ at 326-27 (disclosure of a single method of adheringly applying one layer to another was sufficient to support a generic claim

to “adheringly applying” because one skilled in the art reading the specification would understand that it is unimportant how the layers are adhered, so long as they are adhered); In re Herschler, 591 F.2d 693, 697, 200 USPQ 711, 714 (CCPA 1979) (disclosure of corticosteroid in DMSO sufficient to support claims drawn to a method of using a mixture of a “physiologically active steroid” and DMSO because “use of known chemical compounds in a manner auxiliary to the invention must have a corresponding written description only so specific as to lead one having ordinary skill in the art to that class of compounds. Occasionally, a functional recitation of those known compounds in the specification may be sufficient as that description.”); In re Smythe, 480 F.2d 1376, 1383, 178 USPQ 279, 285 (CCPA 1973) (the phrase “air or other gas which is inert to the liquid” was sufficient to support a claim to “inert fluid media” because the description of the properties and functions of the air or other gas segmentizing medium would suggest to a person skilled in the art that appellant’s invention includes the use of “inert fluid” broadly.).

The specification as filed provides numerous CpG immunostimulatory nucleic acids, however the specification and claims do not indicate or give guidance in determining which of the CpG nucleic acids of the genus will function as set forth in the method of the claimed invention.

The rejection is maintained for the reasons of record. Applicant's arguments filed July 23, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants have asserted that based on both the description of the necessary and common structural features of the claimed genus and the provision of over 200 species of the claimed genus, Applicant considers that the written

description requirement is satisfied. However, it is noted that all of the examples in the specification are written in prophetic terms; none of the species of the claimed genus have been shown to have the claimed function. Applicants have claimed a large genus of CpG immunostimulatory nucleic acids. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice (see i)(A), above), reduction to drawings (see i)(B), above), or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus (see i)(C), above). See *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

In the instant case, the CpG immunostimulatory nucleic acid should be able to treat or prevent an asthmatic event in a hypo-responsive subject having allergic asthma, comprising: administering to a hypo-responsive subject having allergic asthma a CpG immunostimulatory nucleic acid in an effective amount for treating or preventing an asthmatic event, wherein the hypo-responsive subject is refractory to an asthma/allergy medicament. However, the specification does not indicate which one of the 1093 nucleotide sequences found on Table 1 (pp. 12-33) functions in a method for treating or preventing an asthmatic event in a hypo-responsive subject having allergic asthma, comprising: administering to a hypo-responsive subject having allergic asthma a CpG immunostimulatory nucleic acid in an effective amount for treating or preventing an asthmatic event, wherein the hypo-responsive subject is refractory to an asthma/allergy medicament. While it

is true that the 218 species embraced the genus or have the structure of the claimed genus, are any of the species immunostimulatory? Can these species be used in the claimed method? The recited composition or immunostimulatory nucleic acid should have structure and function.

6. Claims 12, 15-17, 38-40, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48 and 52-54 are objected to because of the following informalities: The preamble to independent claim recites "method for treating or preventing" (see line 1 of the claim), however at lines 7-8 of the claim only "treating" is recited. Appropriate correction is required.

7. No claims are allowed.


8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to N. M. Minnifield whose telephone number is 571-272-0860. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's *acting* supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on 571-272-00974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


N. M. Minnifield
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1645

NMM
October 12, 2007